

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## REMARKS

Applicant's counsel thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the application. Dependent claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 have been amended to delete the term 'streamlined' as being redundant in view of the specification. See page 5, lines 29-32 which states "... a compact portion 28 of the application being initially invoked to provide a streamlined subset of functions..."

Dependent claim 9 has been added to cover the situation where the portions (of the server component) are incrementally loaded prior to execution on the server computer in response to the one or more commands from the one or more command selectors for the client/server application. Support for this new claim 9 can be found, for example, on page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 2. In this paragraph at line 30, and elsewhere, the "invoking of the portion" would be understood by those persons skilled in the art as including the steps of loading the portion into execution memory from some form of backing store (such as a disk drive) and then causing its execution, including initialising.

No new matter has been introduced by way of the amendment to the claims. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner enter the amendments to the claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kevner (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,509).

The rejections are respectfully traversed for reasons as set out below.

The present invention addresses the problem of execution times (or rather response times) for a client/server application. It is well known that as application software has become more sophisticated and included more and more functions, the time for initializing and preparing it for operation, including loading into memory when necessary, (all of which are included in the execution time) has increased compared to earlier, simpler applications. This effect is noticeable even on personal computers; the time to load Microsoft Word can be measured in seconds. Even on today's large servers providing access to corporate databases using business reporting software, the processes of loading and initialization during execution results in extended delays. To reduce the execution times for a client/server application, a system and method in accordance with the present invention incrementally executes applications in the server. This is explained in the description on page 5, lines 29-32 which clearly states "Execution of the application occurs in stages, with a compact portion 28 of the application being initially invoked to provide a streamlined subset of functions applicable to commands most commonly requested to provide a fast executing initial portion of the application." When read in conjunction with the background,

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

which on page 2, lines 4-6, states "What is needed is a method of providing a reduction in execution times for client/server applications without the requirement for separate, resource intensive components...", it is clear that the intention of the present invention is to provide improvements at the server (with some benefit at the client in many cases), not at the client alone.

In the response to the previous office action, it was argued,

"...the functions requested by the client computer are incrementally provided to the client computer in response to one or more request commands from the client computer.

The system executes a compact portion of the server-side application logic on the server computer to provide a fast executing initial portion of the application. Should the function requested lie outside the function set of the compact portion, an applicable additional executable portion is loaded and executed on the server computer, combining its function(s) with the first portion's function(s) (page 5, line 26 to page 6, line 2). Thus, the system and method enables a large decrease in the number of lines of script at initial runtime when compared with a full version of an application (page 6, lines 32 to 34)." (Emphasis added.)

Note that the reference to lines of script in the description refers to applications running in the server not in the client. Nowhere in the present description is there reference to applications running in the client apart from in the background section where such an approach is described on page 1, lines 30-35 as an unsatisfactory alternative: "browser applets have been employed, involving a heavily coded client requiring a virtual machine separate from the browser".

Lightweight components are loaded into the client - the one or more command selectors - however these only invoke the server code portions as required.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kevner, which among other things provides for the structured loading of information (data and code) onto the client, does not teach either the approach or the implementation taught in the present application. Kevner teaches that applications on the server can allow the client to continue while waiting for a response from the server, and this is not claimed here. Kevner embraces the use of client applications, something specifically considered not suitable for the environment of the present invention: on page 1, line 30-page 2, line 6 which deprecatingly refers to "... heavily coded client..." etc.

We respond now to each of the Examiner's points in turn:

Regarding "a server component comprising the plurality of portions ..." in claim 1, the Examiner referred to Kevner 7:1 - 5 that refers only to "application includes a client portion and a server portion". By contrast, according to claim 1, it is clear that more than one portion is envisaged in the server component.

## BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Regarding "associated code ..." in claim 1, the Examiner referred to Kevner 28:12 – 17 where the select command in question relates to the client CHAT application. By contrast, "associated code ..." in claim 1 refers to selection from a plurality of portions in the server components.

Regarding "an associated parameter ..." in claim 1, the Examiner referred to Kevner 28:1 – 5 and 13:13 – 21 where the parameters are used to complete the information to determine which further parameters are expected be returned from the application. By contrast, "an associated parameter ..." in claim 1 refers to a parameter used to determine which portion of the application in the server should be executed on the server computer.

In the claim, the portions are incrementally executed on the server computer. At Kevner 3:30 – 37, 4:30 – 37 and 8:14 – 21 the applications (data) referred to are resident in the client.

Regarding claim 2, the present application deals with the initial execution of portions on the server. Kevner 9:42 – 55 neither discloses nor suggests this feature at all, but rather makes a general statement that users can and do access multiple services throughout a session.

Regarding claim 3, the present invention is concerned with applications in the server. Kevner at 16:45 – 60 is concerned with memory allocation within the client.

Regarding claim 4, portions of application in the present invention relate to server operation. Kevner 8:35 – 50 is concerned with aspects of client operation.

Responding next to the Examiner's arguments re the previous response:

(1) The claim element specifies the incremental execution of one application using portions. Kevner 8:14 – 21 refers to the general case of remote request; it merely teaches that a user can request various separate applications to be executed.

(2) The claim element refers to a parameter used to determine which portion of the application in the server should be executed. Kevner 13:13 – 21 as explained earlier, teaches that the parameters are used to complete the information to determine which further parameters are expected be returned from the application.

(3) We respectfully traverse the Examiner's interpretation that requests for additional data is an equivalent limitation to that expressed in the applicants argument, since such a function differs considerably from that of selecting for execution additional portions of applications on the server.

Regarding claims 5, 6, 7, and 8, the rationale for their arguments are as for their respective equivalent claims 3, 5, 3 and 4, respectively.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1 to 9 are patentable in view of the cited reference. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In view of the above amendments and remarks and having dealt with all the objections raised by the Examiner, reconsideration and allowance of the application is courteously requested.

If any additional fees are required by this communication, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, Order No. 33263US1.

Respectfully Submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By John P. Murtaugh  
John P. Murtaugh, Reg. No. 34226

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: Jan. 6, 2006